THE CLUSTER *L+H+H IN GREEK

KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK

The Greek sequences of a long vowel plus liquid (V+L) can be derived not only from PIE. $^*L+H$ (liquid plus laryngeal) in the final position (as suggested by Hamp), but also from the original Proto-Indo-European clusters of a liquid plus laryngeal plus laryngeal (L+H+H) in the position before vowels. This hypothesis is supported by an etymological analysis of four Greek items.

In his excellent paper «Final *liquid + laryngeal in Greek» (Γλωσσολογία 2–3, 1983 – 1984, publ. 1985, pp. 163–168) Eric P. Hamp tries to explain twelve Greek sequences of long vowel + liquid (\bar{V} +L) as regularly deriving from Proto - Indo - European liquid + laryngeal (L+H) in final position. For instance, he derives the Greek term for «foal, filly», $\pi \delta \lambda o \varsigma$, from the archetype * $p_c^l H_3$ - (cf. Germanic *fulan «foal» and *fulio «filly»), suggesting that its o-stem is a later prehistoric suffixation, obligatory in the case of final *-λ. In addition, he claims that the derivational processes then concealed «the regular Auslaut nature of these developments» (p. 168).

Hamp's reconstructions are theoretically possible, as the proposed development generally agrees with that in Sanskrit, where the group L+H gives $\bar{u}L$ or $\bar{i}L$ not only before consonants (and sonants), but also in the final position, e.g.

- (A) PIE. (t) $p_0^i H_3$ ->* $p \tilde{u}r$ -> Skt. $p \tilde{u}h$ f. «wall, rampart» (acc. sg. p u r e m, dat. sg. p u r e m, etc.); for further cognates, see below (C).
- (B) PIE. * $g^w \dot{r} H_2 -> *g \dot{\bar{t}} r->$ Avestan gar- f. «praise, praise—song» = Skt. $g \dot{\bar{t}} h$ f. «word, invocation, praise» (acc. sg. giram, dat. sg. giré, etc.); see also Skt. gūrtih f. «approval, praise», Latin grātes (f. pl.) «Dank» (both from * $g^w \dot{r} H_2 t is$).

It is a well known fact, however, that the oblique cases of these Sanskrit words preserve the short vowel in the sequence $-\bar{u}L_-/-\bar{l}L_-$ ($<*L_0H$) before vowels. The same phenomenon can be observed in the Old Indic derivatives (e.g. *púram* n. «wall, city, town»), and Greek follows Sanskrit in this respect, e.g.

- (C) PIE. * $(t)p_i^lH_3$ -i-s (f.) «walled town» > Skt. (lex.) purih f. «city, town, Gk. $\pi(\tau)$ òλις f., Lithuanian pilis, Latvian pils f. «id».
- (D) PIE. * $(H_2)_rH_1$ -es-yá H_2 (f.) > Skt. irasyấ f. «malevolence», Gk. Attic ἀρειά, Ion. ἀρειή f. «menaces, threats».
- (E) PIE. *plH-ú- (adj.) «much, many» > Skt. purú- adj. «much, many, abundant», Av. pouru-, Old Persian paru-, Gk. πολύς adj. «many», etc.

This is why we can hardly agree with Hamp's proposal of a later prehistorical suffixation. It does not mean that there is an essential fault in his observations. On the

contrary, they are perfect and well founded, and I also accept Hamp's words that «no principled solution is to be found in conventional known consonant clusters» (p. 163).

K. T. Witczak | The cluster L + H + H in Greek

To explain the «burdensome» instances of the Greek sequence of a long vowel plus liquid, given by Eric P. Hamp, we must recall three analogical examples taken from Pokorny's *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (henceforth: IEW). All these examples belong to the typical Sanskrit - Greek equations, where Sanskrit $\bar{u}L$ - corresponds exactly with the Greek sequence of long vowel plus liquid.

(1) Skt. mūla- n. «root», also mūra- n. «id.» vs. Gk. μῶλυ n. «a fabulous plant» (Hom.), «garlic, Allium nigrum» (Theophr., Dioscur.), also μώλυζα f. «a head of garlic» (see IEW 750).

The etymon of these words has been an embarrassment from the beginning. Pokorny's double reconstruction *mo[u]-lo-/*mū-lo- «Wurzel, Pflanze» hangs in the air, and therefore Mayrhofer doubts about the Greek-Sanskrit equation, classifying the Old Indic word in question as «nicht eindeutig erklärt» (Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen II 667, henceforth: KEWAi). However, the comparison seems essentially firm.

How can we explain the observed sequence of a long vowel plus liquid in Greek, corresponding with Sanskrit $\bar{u}L$ -? Following Hamp, we might assume that the early shape of these words was * mlH_3 -. But this stem, when thematized as o-stem should have given the forms *mula-, *mura- in Sanskrit (not mula nor mura-). On the other hand, the sequence $\bar{u}L$ - (or $-\bar{l}L$ -), if derived from PIE. *LH, is kept in exactly the same form when it precedes a sonant or consonant. Thus the related word * mlH_3 -wá H_2 is reflected as Skt. $murv\bar{u}$ (f.) «the plant Sanseviera roxburgiana» and Lat. malva (f.) «mallow». Therefore in the case of mula- we have to postulate an extention of the root base * mlH_3 - by means of the original suffix * $-H_0$ - (and not -o-). Thus Skt. mula-/mula-(n.) «root» comes from PIE. * mlH_3 -Hom. Per analogiam, Gk. $\mu\omega\lambda\nu$ (n.) seems to attest the PIE cluster L+H+H (liquid plus laryngeal plus laryngeal) and to reflect the protoform * mlH_3 -Hu-, if of course it is not a back-formation derived from the above-mentioned appellative * mlH_3 -ul-, a plant (or root)».

(2) Skt. mūráḥ adj. «foolish, stupid», m. «fool», Avestan mura- «blödsinning» (ΚΕΨΑi II 665) vs. Gk. μωρός, Attic μᾶρος adj. «dumm, törricht» (ΙΕΨ 750).

The equation presents the same equivalence in the root base (Skt. $-\bar{u}L$ - beside Gk. $\bar{V}L$) and therefore it should be explained in a similar or even identical way. We can safely derive the Indo-Iranian and Greek words from the uniform PIE. archetype * mrH_3 - $H\acute{o}$ -. The double reconstruction * $m\bar{o}[u]$ -ro-/* $m\bar{u}$ -ro- «stumpfsinnig, törricht» (so Julius Pokorny, IEW 750) has - citing Hamp (p. 164) - «no meaning other that juggling with symbols», thus we are obliged to abandon it as unaccurate.

(3) Skt. $d\bar{u}r\dot{a}\dot{p}$ «far distant», Av. $d\bar{u}ra$ -, OPers. $d\bar{u}ra$ -, NPers. $d\bar{u}r$, Khotan Saka dura«far» vs. Gk. $\delta\eta\rho\dot{o}\varsigma$. Doric $\delta\bar{u}\rho\dot{o}\varsigma$ «lange dauernd», Armenian erkar «long (of time)», see IEW 219 – 220 (sub voce deu–, etc.).

It is usually admitted that the Indo-Iranian terms reflect a primitive form of ${}^*d(w)\bar{u}r\dot{o}s$, while their Greek and Armenian equivalents come from ${}^*dw\bar{a}r\dot{o}s$. However, the relation between ${}^*d(w)\bar{u}r\dot{o}s$ and ${}^*dw\bar{a}r\dot{o}s$ is quite analogous to that of the abovementioned pairs $(m\dot{u}ra - |\mu\omega)\lambda v$ and $m\bar{u}r\dot{a}-|\mu\omega)\dot{o}\zeta$. It now seems reasonable to suggest

an uniform PIE. prototype. The reconstruction *dw-rH₂-Hós may be easily attributed on the basis of the lexical material. On the other hand, Gk. $\delta \hat{\eta} \nu$ (Eleian, Doric $\delta \hat{a} \nu$) «long, far» and Arm. erkain «long (of space)» seem to represent the original PIE. form *dw- $\hat{\eta}$ H₂, supporting by analogy Hamp's view on Greek reflexation of the cluster L + H in final position.

In the same fashion we can analyse some of Hamp's instances. Returning to the controversial problem of the «foal» terminology, we have to notice that Greek $\pi\omega\lambda\sigma$ («foal, filly» (o-stem) resembles perfectly Armenian ul «kid, young of deer or gazelle» (o-stem) and, if the development of the cluster L+H+H is similar (or even identical) in Greek and Armenian, as it seems to be, both come back to the original PIE. archetype *pl(H_3H -o-s) (and not * poH_3l -o-s). Thus the word base is PIE. *pl(H_3H -«a young animal, esp. foal». Following Hamp (p. 164), we may regard further Indo-European cognates as a n-thematisation:

- (a) Gothic fula, Old Norse foli m., Old English fola, Old High German folo, etc. «foal, colt» (< Germanic *fulan- < PIE. *plH3on-m.);
- (b) Welsh elein, pl. alaned «roe, fawn» (< Celtic *halan \bar{i} < PIE. * $plH_3 \ni n-iH_2$ f.);
- (c) Albanian pelë f. «mare» (< PAlb. * $paln\bar{i}$ < PIE. * $plH_3 \partial n iH_2$ f.).

We can now summarize our findings:

- (1) There is satisfactory evidence for the original cluster of two PIE. laryngeals. No possibility of the existence of such a cluster has been taken into account by Hamp himself nor by other researchers, though it is quite permissible from a phonological point of view. Note, for instance, that the shape of the above–reconstructed term for «foal» (PIE. $*piH_3Hos$ Gk. $\pi\tilde{\omega}\lambda o\varsigma$) does not differ generally from that of the original appellative for «bear» (PIE. $*H_2\dot{\tau}tkos$, Gk. $\check{\alpha}\rho\kappa\tau o\varsigma$).
- (2) The primitive PIE. cluster L + H + H (liquid plus laryngeal plus laryngeal), occuring in the position before a vowel, is reflected in Greek as $\bar{V} + L$ (long vowel plus liquid) and in Old Indic as $\bar{u}L$ and perhaps $\bar{i}L$.
 - (3) We have identified the following early Greek etyma:

```
*m / H_3-Hu > Gk. \mu \tilde{\omega} \lambda v.
```

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak The University of Łodz, Poland

^{*} mrH_3 - $H\acute{o}s > Gk. \mu\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, Attic $\mu\tilde{\omega}\rho o\varsigma$.

^{*} $dw_T H_2$ - $H \acute{o}s > Gk. \delta \eta \rho \acute{o}\varsigma$, Doric $\delta \bar{a} \rho \acute{o}\varsigma$.

^{*} $p i H_3 H$ -os > Gk. $\pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda o \varsigma$, Mycenaean po-ro (dual).